EXHIBIT C

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

FRANKI BOLORIN, ET AL., Plaintiffs, v. DAVID F. BORRINO, ET AL., Defendants.	CASE NO. 3:06CV1295(AWT)

ORDER

Pending before the court is the plaintiffs' Renewed Motion to Compel Discovery (doc. #32).

On or before January 10, 2008, the defendants shall deliver to the chambers of the undersigned one copy of all documents at issue in the plaintiffs' Renewed Motion to Compel and as to which the defendants maintain their claim of attorney-client privilege. Each document shall be numbered for identification purposes.

Also on or before January 10, 2008, the defendants shall file with the court, and serve upon the plaintiffs, an amended privilege log which reflects the numbering on the documents submitted to chambers. The amended privilege log shall comply fully with D. Conn. L. Civ. R. 37(a) and shall also indicate which document is responsive to each of the disputed discovery requests set forth in the plaintiffs' motion.

"[A] federal court sitting in diversity must apply state law to privilege issues." EDO Corp. v. Newark Ins. Co., 145

F.R.D. 18, 21 (D. Conn. 1992). Under Connecticut law, "the attorney-client privilege protects both the confidential giving of professional advice by an attorney acting in the capacity of a legal advisor to those who can act on it, as well as the giving of information to the lawyer to enable counsel to give sound and informed advice." PSE Consulting, Inc. v. Frank Mercede & Sons, Inc., 267 Conn. 279, 329 (Conn. 2004). The defendants are reminded that communications solely regarding matters of fact are ordinarily not privileged. See Olson v. Accessory Controls & Equipment Corp., 254 Conn. 145, 157 (2000).

SO ORDERED at Hartford, Connecticut this 20th day of December, 2007.

/s/
Donna F. Martinez
United States Magistrate Judge